

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were presented for examination. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The withdrawal of the restriction requirement is acknowledged.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as indefinite, for the misspelling of "multicusp" in Claim 18. This rejection is not understood since "multicusp" appears to be spelled correctly.

Claims 1-3, 6, 11-14, 16, 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Patrick. Claims 4-5, 7-10, 15, 17, 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Patrick. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The crux of these rejections is that Patrick shows in Fig. 3 a matching network comprising a resonantly tuned circuit 34 formed of a variable capacitor 44 and an inductor 36 in a series resonance configuration, and a ferrite core transformer. However, this is incorrect, as a comparison of Applicant's Fig. 1 to Patrick's Fig. 3 and the accompanying descriptions readily shows.

Patrick's inductor 36 is the primary coil of the transformer (col. 3, lines 10-11), which corresponds to Applicant's primary winding 16. A transformer has a primary and secondary winding. Patrick's secondary loop 38 corresponds to Applicant's secondary winding 14. Patrick's primary coil 36 is not electrically in series with variable capacitor 44; it is electrically isolated from and inductively coupled to the secondary circuit, which contains the variable capacitor 44. Thus Patrick's variable capacitor 44 does not have a separate inductor in series as shown and claimed by Applicant where there is a separate inductor L in series

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

with C to form the tunable circuit with series resonance configuration. Primary coil 36 cannot be used for two different parts of Applicant's claimed network, as is clear from the rejection of Claim 2 where the Examiner indicates that coil 36 is the primary winding, which is a separate element from the inductor in Applicant's tunable circuit.

For a proper 102 rejection every element and limitation of the claims must be found in the reference. A tunable circuit formed of a variable capacitor and inductor in series resonance configuration is clearly not shown in Patrick. The remainder of the rejections become moot since they all depend on this feature, which Patrick does not show or suggest. Therefore the rejections are obviated.

Accordingly it is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited. If any impediment should remain which can be resolved by telephone please call Applicant's Attorney at (510) 486-4534.

Respectfully submitted,



Henry P. Sartorio  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 28,535  
Tel. No. (510) 486-4534

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
One Cyclotron Road  
MS 90B0104  
Berkeley, CA 94720

FAX RECEIVED  
AUG 6 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

OFFICIAL